Distributed Continuous-Time Algorithm for Constrained Convex Optimizations via Nonsmooth Analysis Approach

Xianlin Zeng, Peng Yi, and Yiguang Hong

arXiv:1510.07386v2 [math.OC] 23 Apr 2016

Abstract

This technical note studies the distributed optimization problem of a sum of nonsmooth convex cost functions with local constraints. At first, we propose a novel distributed continuous-time projected algorithm, in which each agent knows its local cost function and local constraint set, for the constrained optimization problem. Then we prove that all the agents of the algorithm can find the same optimal solution, and meanwhile, keep the states bounded while seeking the optimal solutions. We conduct a complete convergence analysis by employing nonsmooth Lyapunov functions for the stability analysis of differential inclusions. Finally, we provide a numerical example for illustration.

Key Words: Constrained distributed optimization, continuous-time algorithms, multi-agent systems, nonsmooth analysis, projected dynamical systems.

I. Introduction

The distributed optimization of a sum of convex functions is an important class of decision and data processing problems over network systems, and has been intensively studied in recent years (see [1]–[6] and references therein). In addition to the discrete-time distributed optimization algorithms (e.g., [1], [2]), continuous-time multi-agent solvers have recently been applied to distributed optimization problems as a promising and useful technique [3]–[8], thanks to the well-developed continuous-time stability theory.

Constrained distributed optimization, in which the feasible solutions are limited to a certain region or range, is significant in a number of network decision applications, including multi-robot motion planning, resource allocation in communication networks, and economic dispatch in power grids. In practice, local constraints in the distributed optimization design are often necessary due to the performance limitations of the agents in computation and communication capacities as well as task requirements of privacy and security. For example, in large-scale optimization problems, the computation/communication capacity of a single agent may not be enough to handle all the constraints

This work was supported by Beijing Natural Science Foundation (4152057), NSFC (61333001), Program 973 (2014CB845301/2/3), and China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2015M581190).

The authors are with Key Laboratory of Systems and Control, Institute of Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190, China (e-mail: xianlin.zeng@amss.ac.cn; yipeng@amss.ac.cn; yghong@iss.ac.cn).

of the agents; in alignment or resource allocation problems, each agent's feasible choice is limited to a certain range, while the agents may not want to share their private information with others; and in strategic social networks, the agents keep their own limit constraints or budget constraints confidential for security concerns. However, due to the consideration of local constraints, the design of such algorithms, to minimize the global cost functions within the feasible set while allowing the agents operate with only local cost functions and local constraints, is a very difficult task. Conventionally, the projection method has been widely adopted in the algorithm design for constrained optimization [9], [10] and related problems [11]. [6] constructed a primal-dual type continuous-time projected algorithm to solve a distributed optimization problem, where each agent has its own private constraint function, while [8] proposed a continuous-time distributed projected dynamics for constrained optimization, where the agents share the same constraint set. Moreover, [12] presented a primal-dual continuous-time projected algorithm for distributed nonsmooth optimization, where each agent has its own local bounded constraint set, though its auxiliary variables may be asymptotically unbounded.

The purpose of this technical note is to propose a novel continuous-time projected algorithm for distributed nonsmooth convex optimization problems where each agent has its own general local constraint set. The main contributions of the note are four folds. Firstly, a distributed continuous-time algorithm is proposed for the agents to find the same optimal solution based only on local cost functions and local constraint sets, by combining primal-dual methods for saddle point seeking and projection methods for set constraints. The proposed algorithm is consistent with those in [3]–[5] when there were no constraints in the optimization problem. Secondly, nonsmooth cost functions are considered here, while smooth cost functions were discussed in most continuous-time distributed optimization designs [6], [7]. To solve the complicated problem, nonsmooth Lyapunov functions are employed along with the stability theory of differential inclusions (resulting from the nonsmooth cost functions) to conduct a complete and original convergence analysis. Thirdly, our proposed algorithm is proved to solve the optimization problem and have bounded states while seeking the optimal solutions, and therefore, further improves the recent interesting result in [12], whose algorithm may have asymptotically unbounded states. Finally, different from the strict/strong convexity in existing results [6], [7], general convexity is investigated. In fact, our nonsmooth analysis techniques also guarantee the convergence of the algorithm even when the problem has a continuum of optimal solutions due to the convexity. Therefore, the convergence analysis provides additional insights and understandings for continuous-time distributed optimization algorithms compared with [3], [5]–[7].

The remainder of this note is organized as follows. In Section II, notation and mathematical definitions are presented and reviewed. In Section III, a constrained convex (nonsmooth) optimization problem is formulated and a distributed continuous-time projected algorithm is proposed. In Section IV, a complete proof is presented to show that the algorithm state is bounded and the agents' estimates are convergent to the same optimal solution, and simulation studies are carried out for illustration. Finally, in Section V, concluding remarks are given.

II. Mathematical Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce necessary notations, definitions and preliminaries about graph theory and projection operators.

A. Notation

$\mathbb{R}$ denotes the set of real numbers, $\mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the set of n-dimensional real column vectors, $\mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ denotes the set of n-by-m real matrices, $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^q)$ denotes the collection of all subsets of $\mathbb{R}^q$, I_n denotes the $n\times n$ identity matrix, and $(\cdot)^{\mathrm{T}}$ denotes transpose, respectively. We write $\operatorname{rank} A$ for the rank of the matrix A, $\operatorname{range}(A)$ for the range of the matrix A, $\ker(A)$ for the kernel of the matrix A, $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ for the largest eigenvalue of the matrix A, $\mathbf{1}_n$ for the $n\times 1$ ones vector, $\mathbf{0}_n$ for the $n\times 1$ zeros vector, and $A\otimes B$ for the Kronecker product of matrices A and B. Furthermore, $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm, $A>0$ ($A\geq 0$) denotes that matrix $A\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is positive definite (positive semi-definite), $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ denotes the closure of the subset $\mathcal{S}\subset\mathbb{R}^n$, $\operatorname{int}(\mathcal{S})$ denotes the interior of the subset $\mathcal{S}$, $\dim(\mathcal{S})$ denotes the dimension of the vector space $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}}(x)$ is the normal cone of $\mathcal{S}$ at an element $x\in\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}(x)$ is the tangent cone of $\mathcal{S}$ at an element $x\in\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(p), p\in\mathbb{R}^n, \epsilon>0$, denotes the open ball *centered* at p with *radius* ϵ, $\operatorname{dist}(p,\mathcal{M})$ denotes the distance from a point p to the set $\mathcal{M}$, that is, $\operatorname{dist}(p,\mathcal{M})\triangleq\inf_{x\in\mathcal{M}}\|p-x\|$, $x(t)\to\mathcal{M}$ as $t\to\infty$ denotes that $x(t)$ approaches the set $\mathcal{M}$, that is, for each $\epsilon>0$ there exists $T>0$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(x(t),\mathcal{M})<\epsilon$ for all $t>T$.

B. Graph Theory

A weighted undirected graph $\mathcal{G}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E},A)$, where $\mathcal{V}=\{1,\ldots,n\}$ is a set of nodes, $\mathcal{E}\subset\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{V}$ is a set of edges, $A=[a_{i,j}]\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is a *weighted adjacency matrix* such that $a_{i,j}=a_{j,i}>0$ if $\{i,j\}\in\mathcal{E}$ and $a_{i,j}=0$ otherwise. The *weighted Laplacian matrix* is $L_n=D-A$, where $D\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is diagonal with $D_{i,i}=\sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j}$, $i\in\{1,\ldots,n\}$. In this note, we call L_n the Laplacian matrix and A the adjacency matrix of $\mathcal{G}$ for convenience when there is no confusion. Specifically, if the weighted undirected graph $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, then $L_n\geq 0$, $\operatorname{rank} L_n=n-1$, and $\ker(L_n)=\{k\mathbf{1}_n : k\in\mathbb{R}\}$.

C. Projection Operator

Define $P_K(\cdot)$ as a projection operator given by $P_K(u) = \arg\min_{v\in K}\|u-v\|$, where $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$..

Lemma 2.1: [20] If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed convex set, then

$$(u - P_K(u))^{\mathrm{T}}(v - P_K(u)) \leq 0, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \forall v \in K. \tag{1}$$

III. Problem Description and Optimization Algorithm

A. Problem Description

Consider a network of n agents interacting over a graph $\mathcal{G}$. There is a local cost function $f^i : \mathbb{R}^q \to \mathbb{R}$ and a local feasible constraint set $\Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$. The global cost function of the network is $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n f^i(x)$, and the feasible set is the intersection of local constraint sets, that is, $x \in \Omega_0 \triangleq \bigcap_{i=1}^n \Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^q$. Then a distributed algorithm is needed to solve

$$\min_{x\in\Omega_0} f(x), \quad f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n f^i(x), \quad x \in \Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^q, \tag{2}$$

where each agent only uses its own local cost function, its local constraint, and the shared information of its neighbors through constant local communications.

To ensure the wellposedness of the problem, the following assumption is needed.

Assumption 3.1: Consider the optimization problem (2).

1) The weighted graph $\mathcal{G}$ is connected and undirected.
2) For all $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, f^i is continuous and convex on an open set containing Ω_i, and $\Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ is closed and convex with $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathrm{int}(\Omega_i) \neq \emptyset$.
3) There exists at least one finite optimal solution to problem (2).

Remark 3.1: Problem (6) covers many problems in the recent distributed optimization studies. For example, it introduces the constraints compared with the unconstrained optimization model in [4]. Moreover, it generalizes the model in [8] by allowing heterogeneous constraints, and extends the models in [6] and [12], which considered function constraints and hyper box (sphere) constraints, respectively. ♦

Let $x_i(t) \in \Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ be the estimate of agent i at time instant $t \geq 0$ for the optimal solution. Let $\mathbf{L} \triangleq L_n \otimes I_q \in \mathbb{R}^{nq\times nq}$, where $L_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times}$ is the Laplacian matrix of $\mathcal{G}$. Denote $\mathbf{x} \triangleq [x_1^{\mathrm{T}},\ldots,x_n^{\mathrm{T}}]^{\mathrm{T}} \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ and denote $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n f^i(x_i)$ with $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, where $\Omega \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^n \Omega_i$ is the Cartesian product of Ω_i, $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$. Then, we arrive at the following lemma by directly analyzing the optimality condition.

Lemma 3.1: Suppose Assumption 3.1 holds and $\alpha > 0$. $x^* \in \Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ is an optimal solution to problem (2) if and only if there exist $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes x^* \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ and $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ such that

$$\mathbf{0}_{nq} \in \left\{P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)}(-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda^*) : \ g(\mathbf{x}^*) \in \partial\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*)\right\}, \tag{3a}$$

$$\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{0}_{nq}, \tag{3b}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)$ is the tangent cone of Ω at an element $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Omega$ and $P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)}(\cdot)$ is the projection operator to $\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)$.

Proof: It follows from Theorem 3.33 in [10] that x^* is an optimal solution to problem (2) if and only if

$$\mathbf{0}_q \in \partial f(x^*) + \mathcal{N}_{\Omega_0}(x^*), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{\Omega_0}(x^*)$ is the normal cone of Ω_0 at $x^* \in \Omega_0 = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \Omega_i$. Note that $f^i(\cdot)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, is convex and $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathrm{int}(\Omega_i) \neq \emptyset$ followed by Assumption 3.1. It follows from Theorem 2.85 and Lemma 2.40 in [10] that $\partial f(x^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \partial f^i(x^*)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\Omega_0}(x^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{N}_{\Omega_i}(x^*)$. To prove this lemma, one only needs to show (4) holds if and only if (3) is satisfied.

Suppose (3) holds. Since graph $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, it follows from (3b) that there exists $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^q$ such that $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes x^* \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$. Note that $\mathbf{0}_{nq} = P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)}(-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda^*)$ if and only if $-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda^* \in \mathcal{N}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)$. Let $a_{i,j}$ be the (i,j)th entry of the adjacency matrix of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\lambda^* = [(\lambda_1^*)^{\mathrm{T}}, \ldots, (\lambda_n^*)^{\mathrm{T}}]^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ with $\lambda_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^q$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Then (3a) holds if and only if there exists $g_i(x^*) \in \partial f^i(x^*)$ such that $-g_i(x^*) - \alpha\sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j}(\lambda_i^* - \lambda_j^*) \in \mathcal{N}_{\Omega_i}(x^*), i = 1, ..., n$. Because $L_n = L_n^{\mathrm{T}}$ since $\mathcal{G}$ is undirected, $\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j}(\lambda_i^* - \lambda_j^*) = 1/2\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{i,j} - a_{j,i})(\lambda_i^* - \lambda_j^*) = \mathbf{0}_q$ and $-\sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x^*) \in \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{N}_{\Omega_i}(x^*) = \mathcal{N}_{\Omega_0}(x^*)$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x^*) \in \sum_{i=1}^n \partial f^i(x^*) = \partial f(x^*)$, (4) is thus proved.

Conversely, suppose (4) holds. Let $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes x^*$. (3b) is clearly true. It follows from (4) that there exists $g_i(x^*) \in \partial f^i(x^*)$ such that $-\sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x^*) \in \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{N}_{\Omega_i}(x^*)$. Choose $z_i(x^*) \in \mathcal{N}_{\Omega_i}(x^*)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, such that $-\sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i(x^*)$. Next, define vectors $l_i(x^*) \triangleq z_i(x^*) + g_i(x^*)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. It is clear that $\sum_{i=1}^n l_i(x^*) = \mathbf{0}_q$. Note that $\mathbf{L}$ is symmetric since $\mathcal{G}$ is undirected. By the fundamental theorem of linear algebra, the sets $\ker(\mathbf{L})$ and $\mathrm{range}(\mathbf{L})$ form an orthogonal decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^{nq}$. Define $l(x^*) \triangleq [l_1(x^*)^{\mathrm{T}}, ..., l_n(x^*)^{\mathrm{T}}]^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$. For all $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes x \in \ker(\mathbf{L})$, $l(x^*)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i(x^*)^{\mathrm{T}}x = 0$ and, hence, $l(x^*) \in \mathrm{range}(\mathbf{L})$ and there exists $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ such that $l(x^*) = -\alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda^*$. Thus, there exists $\lambda^* = [(\lambda_1^*)^{\mathrm{T}}, \ldots, (\lambda_n^*)^{\mathrm{T}}]^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ with $\lambda_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^q$ such that $-g_i(x^*) - \alpha\sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j}(\lambda_i^* - \lambda_j^*) = -g_i(x^*) + l_i(x^*) = z_i(x^*) \in \mathcal{N}_{\Omega_i}(x^*), i = 1, ..., n$, where $a_{i,j}$ is the (i,j)th entry of the adjacency matrix of $\mathcal{G}$. Hence, there exists $g(\mathbf{x}^*) \in \partial\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ and $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ such that $-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda^* \in \mathcal{N}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)$,

equivalently, $\mathbf{0}_{nq} = P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)}(-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda^*)$. (3a) is proved. ■

B. Distributed Continuous-Time Projected Algorithm

Consider the optimization problem (2), we propose the optimization algorithm of agent i as follows:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = P_{\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_i}(\mathbf{x}_i(t))}\Big[- g_i(x_i(t)) - \alpha\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i,j}(x_i(t) - x_j(t)) - \alpha\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i,j}(\lambda_i(t) - \lambda_j(t))\Big],$$

$$g_i(x_i(t)) \in \partial f^i(x_i(t)), \tag{5a}$$

$$\dot{\lambda}_i(t) = \alpha\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i,j}(x_i(t) - x_j(t)), \tag{5b}$$

where $t \geq 0$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $x_i(0) = x_{i0} \in \Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^q$, $\lambda_i(0) = \lambda_{i0} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, $\alpha > 0$, and $a_{i,j}$ is the (i,j)th element of the adjacency matrix of graph $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_i}(x_i(t))$ is the tangent cone of Ω_i at an element $x_i(t) \in \Omega_i$ and $P_{\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_i}(x_i(t))}(\cdot)$ is the projection operator to $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_i}(x_i(t))$.

Remark 3.2: Algorithm (5) is motivated by the primal-dual type continuous-time algorithms, which was firstly proposed in [3] and later on extended in [4], [6], [7], [12]. If the state constraints are relaxed to $\Omega_i = \mathbb{R}^q$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then algorithm (5) is consistent with the algorithm proposed in Section IV of [4]. Algorithm (5) also incorporates projection operation to handle constraints, which had also been adopted in [8] and [12]. However, [8] only handled homogeneous constraints, and [12] may produce unbounded states, which may be hard to implement in practice. Here our proposed algorithm (5) handles the problems with local constraints and can guarantee the boundedness of states. ♦

IV. Main results

In this section, we first introduce additional preliminaries for nonsmooth analysis, and then give the convergence analysis of the algorithm with an illustrative simulation.

A. Nonsmooth Analysis

To study our algorithm, we need concepts for nonsmooth analysis. Consider the differential inclusion [15] in the form of

$$\dot{x}(t) \in \mathcal{H}(x(t)), \quad x(0) = x_0, \quad t \geq 0, \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{H} : \mathbb{R}^q \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^q)$ is a set-valued map. Let $\tau > 0$. A solution of (6) defined on $[0, \tau] \subset [0, \infty)$ is an absolutely continuous function $x : [0, \tau] \to \mathbb{R}^q$ such that (6) holds for almost all $t \in [0, \tau]$. Recall that the solution $t \mapsto x(t)$ to (6) is a *right maximal solution* if it cannot be extended forward

in time. We assume that all right maximal solutions to (6) exist on $[0,\infty)$. A set $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be *weakly invariant* [16] (resp., *strongly invariant*) with respect to (6) if $\mathcal{M}$ contains a maximal solution [16] (resp., all maximal solutions) of (6) for every $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$. A point x_* is an *almost cluster point* [15, p. 311] of a measurable function $\phi(\cdot)$ when $t \to \infty$ if $\mu\{t \geq 0 : \|\phi(t) - x_*\| \leq \varepsilon\} = \infty$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, where $\mu(\cdot)$ is the Lebesgue measure.

Next, we introduce a result [15, Theorem 3, p. 311] for the existence of an almost cluster point.

Lemma 4.1: Consider the differential inclusion (6). Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an *upper semicontinuous* [15, p. 41] map with nonempty compact values and let $\mathcal{D}$ be a compact, strongly positive invariant set with respect to (6). Let W be a nonnegative lower semicontinuous function defined on $\mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{H}) \triangleq \{(x,y) : y \in \mathcal{H}(x)\}$ and V be a nonnegative lower semicontinuous function defined on $\mathbb{R}^q$. If $\phi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is a solution of (6) with $\phi(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$V(\phi(t)) - V(\phi(s)) + \int_s^t W(\phi(\tau), \dot{\phi}(\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau \leq 0, \quad t \geq s \geq 0,$$

then $\phi(\cdot)$ and $\dot{\phi}(\cdot)$ have almost cluster points x_* and v_*, which satisfy $v_* \in \mathcal{H}(x_*)$ and $W(x_*, v_*) = 0$. If $W(x,v) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and all $v \neq \mathbf{0}_q$, then such an almost cluster point x_* is an equilibrium of the differential inclusion (6).

Furthermore, we introduce a lemma, which is inspired by [18, Proposition 3.1] and is used in the convergence analysis.

Lemma 4.2: Consider the differential inclusion (6). Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a compact, strongly positive invariant set with respect to (6), and $\phi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^q$ be a solution of (6) with $\phi(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{D}$. If z is an almost cluster point of $\phi(\cdot)$ and a Lyapunov stable equilibrium of (6), then $z = \lim_{t\to\infty} \phi(t)$.

Proof: Suppose z is an almost cluster point of $\phi(\cdot)$ and z is Lyapunov stable. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since z is Lyapunov stable, there exists $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, z) > 0$ such that the solution $\tilde{\phi}(t)$ of system (6) with $\tilde{\phi}(0) = y \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(z)$ satisfies that $\tilde{\phi}(t) \in \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(z)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Since z is an almost cluster point of $\phi(\cdot)$, there exists $h = h(\delta, x_0) > 0$ such that $\phi(h) \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(z)$. It follows from our construction of δ that $\phi(t) \in \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(z)$ for all $t \geq h$. Because $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $z = \lim_{t\to\infty} \phi(t)$. ■

B. Convergence Analysis

Let $\mathbf{x} \triangleq [x_1^{\mathrm{T}}, \ldots, x_n^{\mathrm{T}}]^{\mathrm{T}} \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ and $\lambda \triangleq [\lambda_1^{\mathrm{T}}, \ldots, \lambda_n^{\mathrm{T}}]^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ with $\Omega \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^n \Omega_i$. Algorithm (5) can be written in a more compact form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) \\ \dot{\lambda}(t) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}(t), \lambda(t)), \quad \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega, \quad \lambda(0) = \lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}, \tag{7}$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \triangleq \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x})}[-\alpha\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x} - \alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda - g(\mathbf{x})] \\ \alpha\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} : g(\mathbf{x}) \in \partial\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \right\}$, $\mathbf{L} = L_n \otimes I_q \in \mathbb{R}^{nq\times nq}$, $L_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is the Laplacian matrix of graph $\mathcal{G}$, and $\alpha > 0$.

Remark 4.1: The optimization algorithm (7) is of the form $\dot{x}(t) \in P_{\mathcal{T}_K(x(t))}[\mathcal{H}(x(t))]$, where $x(0) = x_0 \in K$ and K is a closed convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^q$, and $\mathcal{H}$ is an upper semicontinuous set-valued map with nonempty compact convex values. It follows from Proposition 2 of [15, p. 266] and Theorem 1 of [15, p. 267] that algorithm (7) has right maximal solutions on $[0,\infty)$. Since $P_{\mathcal{T}_K(x(t))}[\mathcal{H}(x(t))] \subset \mathcal{T}_K(x(t))$, K is a strongly invariant set to $\dot{x}(t) \in P_{\mathcal{T}_K(x(t))}[\mathcal{H}(x(t))]$.

The following lemma provides a result when $\alpha > 0$ and $0 < k < \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n)}$.

Lemma 4.3: Let $L_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be the Laplacian matrix of a connected and undirected graph $\mathcal{G}$. Let $\alpha > 0$ and $0 < k < \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n)}$. Then $\alpha L_n - k\alpha^2 L_n^2 \geq 0$, $\operatorname{rank}(\alpha L_n - k\alpha^2 L_n^2) = n-1$, and $\ker(\alpha L_n - k\alpha^2 L_n^2) = \{d\mathbf{1}_n : d \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Proof: Note that L_n is symmetric since $\mathcal{G}$ is undirected. L_n can be decomposed as $L_n = Q\Lambda Q^{\mathrm{T}}$ via eigenvalue decompositions, where Q is an orthogonal matrix and Λ is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are the eigenvalues of L_n. Thus, $\alpha L_n - k\alpha^2 L_n^2 = Q(\alpha\Lambda - k\alpha^2\Lambda^2)Q^{\mathrm{T}}$, where $\alpha\Lambda - k\alpha^2\Lambda^2$ is clearly a diagonal matrix.

Since $0 < k\alpha < 1/\lambda_{\max}(L_n) = 1/\lambda_{\max}(\Lambda)$ and $L_n \geq 0$, it follows that $0 \leq k\alpha\Lambda_{i,i} < 1$ where $\Lambda_{i,i}$ is the ith diagonal element of Λ. Hence,

$$\begin{cases} \alpha\Lambda_{i,i} - k(\alpha\Lambda_{i,i})^2 > 0 \text{ if } \alpha\Lambda_{i,i} > 0, \\ \alpha\Lambda_{i,i} - k(\alpha\Lambda_{i,i})^2 = 0 \text{ if } \alpha\Lambda_{i,i} = 0, \end{cases} \quad i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}. \tag{8}$$

In addition, $\operatorname{rank} L_n = n-1$ and $L_n \geq 0$ since $\mathcal{G}$ is connected. The diagonal matrix Λ has one zero diagonal entry and $n-1$ positive diagonal entries. Furthermore, it follows from (8) that the diagonal matrix $\alpha\Lambda - k\alpha^2\Lambda^2$ has one zero diagonal entry and $n-1$ positive diagonal entries. Hence, $\alpha\Lambda - k\alpha^2\Lambda^2 \geq 0$ and $\operatorname{rank}(\alpha\Lambda - k\alpha^2\Lambda^2) = n-1$. Since Q is an orthogonal matrix and Q is invertible, $\alpha L_n - k\alpha^2 L_n^2 \geq 0$ and $\operatorname{rank}(\alpha L_n - k\alpha^2 L_n^2) = n-1$. Because $(\alpha L_n - k\alpha^2 L_n^2)\mathbf{1}_n = L_n\mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{0}_n$ and $\operatorname{rank}(\alpha L_n - \alpha^2 L_n^2) = n-1$, it follows from rank-nullity theorem of linear algebra that $\dim(\ker(\alpha L_n - \alpha^2 L_n^2)) = 1$ and $\ker(\alpha L_n - \alpha^2 L_n^2) = \{d\mathbf{1}_n : d \in \mathbb{R}\}$. ■

If 3) of Assumption 3.1 holds, there exists $(\mathbf{x}^*,\lambda^*) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ satisfying (3) followed by Lemma 3.1. Let $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Omega$ and $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ be the vectors such that (3) is satisfied. Define

$$V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\lambda-\lambda^*\|^2, \tag{9}$$

$$V_2^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \triangleq \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*) + \alpha\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x} + \alpha\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}\lambda. \tag{10}$$

Recall that if $\phi(\cdot)$ is a solution of (6) and $V:\mathbb{R}^q\to\mathbb{R}$ is locally Lipschitz and *regular* (see [17, p. 39]), then $\dot{\phi}(t)$ and $\dot{V}(\phi(t))$ exist *almost everywhere*. Next, we give the following result, which provides nonsmooth functions and analyzes their derivatives.

Lemma 4.4: Consider algorithm (5), or equivalently, algorithm (7). Suppose Assumption 3.1 holds. Let $V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ and $V_2^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ be as defined in (9) and (10), and let $(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ be a solution.

(i) $\dot{V}_1^*(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))\le-\alpha\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)\le 0$ for almost all $t\ge 0$.

(ii) $\dot{V}_2^*(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))\le-\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\|^2+\alpha^2\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{L}^2\mathbf{x}(t)$ for almost all $t\ge 0$.

(iii) Let $0<k<\frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n)}$. The function $V^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)=V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)+kV_2^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ is nonnegative with all $(\mathbf{x},\lambda)\in\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{nq}$

(iv) Let $V^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ be as defined in part (iii) with $0<k<\frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n)}$. Then $\dot{V}^*(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))\le-k\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\|^2-\dot{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{Q}\dot{\lambda}(t)\le 0$ for almost all $t\ge 0$, where $\mathbf{Q}\in\mathbb{R}^{nq\times nq}$ is positive definite.

Proof: (i) Let $(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ be a solution. Recall that $\dot{V}_1^*(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ and $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t),\dot{\lambda}(t))$ exist for almost all $t\ge 0$. Suppose $\dot{V}_1^*(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ and $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t),\dot{\lambda}(t))$ exist at a positive time instant t. By (7), there exists $g(\mathbf{x}(t))\in\partial\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t))$ such that $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)=P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}(t))}[-\alpha\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)-\alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda(t)-g(\mathbf{x}(t))]$ and $\dot{\lambda}(t)=\alpha\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)$.

Note that $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)=P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}(t))}[-\alpha\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)-\alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda(t)-g(\mathbf{x}(t))]$ implies that

$$-\alpha\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)-\alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda(t)-g(\mathbf{x}(t))-\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\in\mathcal{N}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}(t)),$$

where $\mathcal{N}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}(t))\triangleq\{d\in\mathbb{R}^{nq}:d^{\mathrm{T}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}-\mathbf{x}(t))\le 0,\,\forall\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in\Omega\}$ is the normal cone of Ω at an element $\mathbf{x}(t)\in\Omega$. Hence,

$$\big(\alpha\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)+\alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda(t)+g(\mathbf{x}(t))+\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\big)^{\mathrm{T}}\big(\mathbf{x}(t)-\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\big)\le 0,\quad\forall\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\in\Omega.$$

By choosing $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}=\mathbf{x}^*$, it follows that

$$\big(\alpha\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)+\alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda(t)+g(\mathbf{x}(t))+\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\big)^{\mathrm{T}}\big(\mathbf{x}(t)-\mathbf{x}^*\big)\le 0. \tag{11}$$

Note that $L_n=L_n^{\mathrm{T}}$ since $\mathcal{G}$ is undirected. And note that $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}^*=\mathbf{0}_{nq}$ followed by (3b). It follows from (11) that

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\big(\mathbf{x}(t)-\mathbf{x}^*\big)\;\le\;-\alpha\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)-\alpha\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{L}\lambda(t)-g(\mathbf{x}(t))^{\mathrm{T}}\big(\mathbf{x}(t)-\mathbf{x}^*\big). \tag{12}$$

Furthermore, it follows from $\dot{\lambda}(t)=\alpha\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)$ that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|\lambda(t)-\lambda^*\|^2=\alpha(\lambda(t)-\lambda^*)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t). \tag{13}$$

In view of (12) and (13),

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}V_1^*(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))\;\le\;-\alpha\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)-g(\mathbf{x}(t))^{\mathrm{T}}\big(\mathbf{x}(t)-\mathbf{x}^*\big)-\alpha{\lambda^*}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)$$

$$= -\alpha \mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t) - \big(g(\mathbf{x}(t)) - g(\mathbf{x}^*)\big)^{\mathrm{T}}\big(\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{x}^*\big)$$
$$-(g(\mathbf{x}^*) + \alpha \mathbf{L}\lambda^*)^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{x}^*), \tag{14}$$

where $g(\mathbf{x}^*) \in \partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ such that $P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)}(-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha \mathbf{L}\lambda^*) = \mathbf{0}_{nq}$.

Note that $P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)}(-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha \mathbf{L}\lambda^*) = \mathbf{0}_{nq}$ implies that $-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha \mathbf{L}\lambda^* \in \mathcal{N}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)$, where $\mathcal{N}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)$ is the normal cone of Ω at an element $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Omega$. Hence, $(-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha \mathbf{L}\lambda^*)^{\mathrm{T}}(p - \mathbf{x}^*) \leq 0$ for all $p \in \Omega$. Since $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \Omega$, we have

$$(-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha \mathbf{L}\lambda^*)^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{x}^*) \leq 0. \tag{15}$$

Also note that

$$\big(g(\mathbf{x}(t)) - g(\mathbf{x}^*)\big)^{\mathrm{T}}\big(\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{x}^*\big) \geq 0$$

followed by the convexity of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ with $g(\mathbf{x}(t)) \in \partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t))$ and $g(\mathbf{x}^*) \in \partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*)$. It follows from (14) that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} V_1^*(\mathbf{x}(t), \lambda(t)) \leq -\alpha \mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t) \leq 0. \tag{16}$$

(*ii*) Let $(\mathbf{x}(t), \lambda(t))$ be a solution. Recall that $\dot{V}_2^*(\mathbf{x}(t), \lambda(t))$ and $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t), \dot{\lambda}(t))$ exist for almost all $t \geq 0$. Suppose $\dot{V}_2^*(\mathbf{x}(t), \lambda(t))$ and $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t), \dot{\lambda}(t))$ exist at a positive time instant t. Let $h \in (0, t]$. Since $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ is convex in $\mathbf{x}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t)) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t-h)) &\leq \langle p, \mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{x}(t-h)\rangle, \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t+h)) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t)) &\geq \langle p, \mathbf{x}(t+h) - \mathbf{x}(t)\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

for all $p \in \partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t))$.

Dividing both sides of the inequalities by $h \in (0, t]$ and let $h \to 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \langle p, \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\rangle, \quad \forall p \in \partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t)). \tag{17}$$

By (7), there exists $g(\mathbf{x}(t)) \in \partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t))$ such that $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}(t))}[-\alpha \mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t) - \alpha \mathbf{L}\lambda(t) - g(\mathbf{x}(t))]$ and $\dot{\lambda}(t) = \alpha \mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)$. Choose $p = g(\mathbf{x}(t))$. Then $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t)) = g(\mathbf{x}(t))^{\mathrm{T}}\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)$. Hence,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} V_2^*(\mathbf{x}(t), \lambda(t)) = [\alpha \mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t) + \alpha \mathbf{L}\lambda(t) + g(\mathbf{x}(t))]^{\mathrm{T}}\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) + \alpha^2 \mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{L}^2\mathbf{x}(t). \tag{18}$$

Set $K = \mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}(t))$, $v = \mathbf{0}_{nq} \in K$, $u = -[\alpha \mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t) + \alpha \mathbf{L}\lambda(t) + g(\mathbf{x}(t))] \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$, and $P_K(u) = \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ in (1). It follows from (1) that $[\alpha \mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t) + \alpha \mathbf{L}\lambda(t) + g(\mathbf{x}(t))]^{\mathrm{T}}\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) \leq -\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\|^2$. Hence, $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} V_2^*(\mathbf{x}(t), \lambda(t)) \leq -\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\|^2 + \alpha^2 \mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{L}^2\mathbf{x}(t)$ followed by (18).

(*iii*) Let $0 < k < \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n)}$ and note that $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{L}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{0}_{nq}$. It can be easily verified that $V^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda) = V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda) + kV_2^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda) = J_1(\mathbf{x},\lambda) + J_2(\mathbf{x}) + J_3(\mathbf{x})$, where $J_1(\mathbf{x},\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\lambda - \lambda^*\|^2 + k\alpha(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}(\lambda-\lambda^*)$, $J_2(\mathbf{x}) = k\alpha\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}$, and $J_3(\mathbf{x}) = k[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*) + \alpha(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}\lambda^*]$. To prove $V^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ is nonnegative for all $(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nq}$, we show $J_1(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \geq 0$, $J_2(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, and $J_3(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nq}$.

Since $\mathbf{L}$ is positive semi-definite,

$$J_2(\mathbf{x}) = k\alpha\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x} \geq 0, \tag{19}$$

and $((\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*) + (\lambda-\lambda^*))^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}((\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*) + (\lambda-\lambda^*)) \geq 0$ for all $(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nq}$. Hence,

$$(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*) + (\lambda-\lambda^*)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}(\lambda-\lambda^*) \geq -(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*)^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{L}+\mathbf{L}^{\mathrm{T}})(\lambda-\lambda^*). \tag{20}$$

Let μ_i, $i = 1,\ldots,n$, be the eigenvalues of $L_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. Since the eigenvalues of I_q are 1, it follows from the properties of Kronecker product that the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{L} = L_n \otimes I_q$ are $\mu_i \times 1$, $i = 1,\ldots,n$. Thus, $\lambda_{\max}(L_n) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{L})$.

Note that $\mathbf{L}$ is symmetric since $\mathcal{G}$ is undirected. Also note $\lambda_{\max}(L_n) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{L})$ and $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{0}_{nq}$. By (20),

$$\begin{aligned} k\alpha(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}(\lambda-\lambda^*) &\geq -\frac{k\alpha}{2}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*) - \frac{k\alpha}{2}(\lambda-\lambda^*)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}(\lambda-\lambda^*) \\ &\geq -\frac{k\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n)}{2}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{k\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n)}{2}\|\lambda-\lambda^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $0 < k < \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n)}$, $1 - k\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n) > 0$ and

$$J_1(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \geq \frac{1}{2}(1-k\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n))\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1-k\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n))\|\lambda-\lambda^*\|^2 \geq 0. \tag{21}$$

Since $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ is convex in $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_3(\mathbf{x}) &= k[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*) + \alpha(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}\lambda^*] \\ &\geq k[(p+\alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda^*)^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*)], \quad \forall p \in \partial\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*). \end{aligned}$$

Note that there exists $g(\mathbf{x}^*) \in \partial\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ such that $P_{\mathcal{T}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}^*)}(-g(\mathbf{x}^*) - \alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda^*) = \mathbf{0}_{nq}$ followed by (3a). Choose $p \triangleq g(\mathbf{x}^*)$. In light of (15) and similar arguments above (15), $(p+\alpha\mathbf{L}\lambda^*)^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ with $p \triangleq g(\mathbf{x}^*)$. Hence,

$$J_3(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega. \tag{22}$$

In view of (19), (21) and (22), $V^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda) = V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda) + kV_2^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ is nonnegative with all $(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nq}$.

(iv) It follows from part (i) and (ii) that $\dot{V}^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \leq -\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)[\alpha\mathbf{L}-k\alpha^2\mathbf{L}^2]\mathbf{x}(t)-k\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\|^2$ for almost all $t \geq 0$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha\mathbf{L}-k\alpha^2\mathbf{L}^2 &= \alpha L_n\otimes I_q-(k\alpha L_n\otimes I_q)(\alpha L_n\otimes I_q)\\ &= \alpha L_n\otimes I_q-(k\alpha^2L_n^2)\otimes(I_q^2)\\ &= (\alpha L_n-k\alpha^2L_n^2)\otimes I_q.\end{aligned}$$

Because $0<k<\frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_{\max}(L_n)}$, $\alpha L_n-k\alpha^2L_n^2\geq 0$, $\mathrm{rank}\,(\alpha L_n-k\alpha^2L_n^2)=n-1$, and $\ker(\alpha L_n-k\alpha^2L_n^2)=\ker(L_n)=\{d\mathbf{1}_n : d\in\mathbb{R}\}$ by Lemma 4.3. Therefore, $\alpha\mathbf{L}-k\alpha^2\mathbf{L}^2$ is positive semi-definite and $\ker(\mathbf{L})=\ker(\alpha\mathbf{L}-k\alpha^2\mathbf{L}^2)=\big\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{nq} : x_i=x_j\in\mathbb{R}^q,\, i,j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\big\}$. Hence, $-\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)(\alpha\mathbf{L}-k\alpha^2\mathbf{L}^2)\mathbf{x}(t)\leq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x}(t)\in\mathbb{R}^{nq}$.

Note that $\alpha\mathbf{L}-k\alpha^2\mathbf{L}^2\geq 0$ and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)(\alpha\mathbf{L}-k\alpha^2\mathbf{L}^2)\mathbf{x}(t)=\mathbf{0}_{nq}$ if and only if $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)=\mathbf{0}_{nq}$. Recalling $\dot{\lambda}(t)=\alpha\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x}(t)$, there exists a positive definite matrix $\mathbf{Q}\in\mathbb{R}^{nq\times nq}$ such that $\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)(\alpha\mathbf{L}-k\alpha^2\mathbf{L}^2)\mathbf{x}(t)=\dot{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{Q}\dot{\lambda}(t)$. Hence, $\dot{V}^*(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))\leq -k\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\|^2-\dot{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{Q}\dot{\lambda}(t)\leq 0$ for almost all $t\geq 0$, where $\mathbf{Q}\in\mathbb{R}^{nq\times nq}$ is positive definite. ■

Based on Lemmas 4.2 and 4.4, we obtain our main result for state boundedness and convergence of the proposed algorithm.

Theorem 4.1: Consider problem (2) with algorithm (5), or equivalently, algorithm (7). Suppose Assumption 3.1 holds and let $(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ be a solution to (5) or (7). Then,

(i) $(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ is bounded;

(ii) $(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ converges to a point $(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda})$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{x}}=\mathbf{1}_n\otimes\bar{x}$ and $\bar{x}$ is an optimal solution to problem (2).

Proof: (i) Let $V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ be as defined in (9). It is clear that $V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ is positive definite, $V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)=0$ if and only if $(\mathbf{x},\lambda)=(\mathbf{x}^*,\lambda^*)$, and $V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)\to\infty$ as $(\mathbf{x},\lambda)\to\infty$.

By (i) of Lemma 4.4, $\dot{V}_1^*(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))\leq 0$ for almost all $t\geq 0$. Hence, $\mathcal{D}\triangleq\{(\mathbf{x},\lambda)\in\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{nq} : V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)\leq M\}$, where $M>0$, is strongly positive invariant. Note that $V_1^*(\cdot,\cdot)$ is positive definite and $V_1^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)\to\infty$ as $(\mathbf{x},\lambda)\to\infty$. Set $\mathcal{D}$ is bounded and the solution $(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ is also bounded. Part (i) is thus proved.

(ii) Let $V^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ be as defined in (iii) of Lemma 4.4. Due to (iv) of Lemma 4.4, $\dot{V}^*(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))\leq -k\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)\|^2-\dot{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\mathbf{Q}\dot{\lambda}(t)\leq 0$ for almost all $t\geq 0$, where $\mathbf{Q}\in\mathbb{R}^{nq\times nq}$ is positive definite. Define $W(\dot{\mathbf{x}},\dot{\lambda})=k\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}\|^2+\dot{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{Q}\dot{\lambda}$. It is clear that $W(\dot{\mathbf{x}},\dot{\lambda})=0$ if and only if $\dot{\mathbf{x}}=\mathbf{0}_{nq}$ and $\dot{\lambda}=\mathbf{0}_{nq}$.

Recall that $(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ is bounded by (i), and $V^*(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ is nonnegative with all $(\mathbf{x},\lambda)\in\Omega\times$

$\mathbb{R}^{nq}$ by (iii) of Lemma 4.4. Note that $V^*(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t)) - V^*(\mathbf{x}(s),\lambda(s)) = \int_s^t \dot{V}^*(\mathbf{x}(\tau),\lambda(\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau \overset{13}{\leq} -\int_s^t W(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\tau),\dot{\lambda}(\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau$ for $t \geq s \geq 0$. It follows from Lemma 4.1 that solution $(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ has an almost cluster point $(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda}) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ and $(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda})$ is an equilibrium point of (7).

Define a function $\bar{V}(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x}-\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\lambda-\bar{\lambda}\|^2$. It is clear that $\bar{V}(\mathbf{x},\lambda)$ is positive definite, $\bar{V}(\mathbf{x},\lambda) = 0$ if and only if $(\mathbf{x},\lambda) = (\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda})$, and $\bar{V}(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \to \infty$ if $(\mathbf{x},\lambda) \to \infty$. Because $(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda})$ is an equilibrium point of (7), $(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda})$ satisfies (3). Moreover, it follows from (i) of Lemma 4.4 that $\bar{V}(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ along the trajectories of (5) satisfies $\dot{\bar{V}}(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t)) \leq 0$ for almost all $t \geq 0$. Hence, $(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda})$ is a Lyapunov stable equilibrium point to the system (5).

Clearly, $(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda})$ is an almost cluster point of $(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ and $(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda})$ is a Lyapunov stable equilibrium. According to Lemma 4.2, $(\mathbf{x}(t),\lambda(t))$ converges to $(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda})$ as $t \to \infty$. Note that $(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\bar{\lambda})$ is proved to be an equilibrium point of (7). By Lemma 3.1, there exists $\bar{x} \in \Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \bar{x}$ and $\bar{x}$ is an optimal solution to problem (2).

Part (ii) is thus proved. ■

Remark 4.2: Theorem 4.1 shows the convergence property of the proposed algorithm. Part (i) of Theorem 4.1 shows that the state trajectories of the algorithm are bounded, while part (ii) of Theorem 4.1 shows that every state trajectory converges to a point corresponding to an optimal solution of (2). The convergence analysis in this note can also be conducted following the framework in [14]. ♦

Remark 4.3: The convergence analysis in this note is based on nonsmooth Lyapunov functions, which can be regarded as an extension of the analysis on basis of smooth Lyapunov functions used in [3], [4], [7]. Moreover, the novel technique proves that algorithm (5) is able to solve optimization problems with a continuum of optimal solutions, and therefore, improves some previous ones in [3], [7], which only handle problems with only one optimal point. ♦

C. Numerical Simulation

The following is a numerical example for illustration.

Example 4.1: Consider the optimization problem (2) with $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\Omega_i = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : i-12 \leq x \leq i-2\}$ and nonsmooth objective functions

$$f^i(x) = \begin{cases} -x+i-5, & \text{if } x < i-5, \\ 0, & \text{if } i-5 \leq x \leq i+5, \\ x-i-5, & \text{if } x \geq i+5, \end{cases} \quad i = 1,\ldots,5.$$

The information sharing graph $\mathcal{G}$ of algorithm (5) is given by Fig. 1. It can be easily verified that $\Omega_0 = \cap_{i=1}^5 \Omega_i = [-7,-1]$ and the optimal solution is $x = -1$, which is on the boundary of the



Fig. 1. Graph Topology



Fig. 2. Trajectories of estimates for x versus time

constraint set Ω_0. If there are no set constraints ($\Omega_i = \mathbb{R}$), every point in the set $[0, 6]$ is an optimal solution.

The trajectories of estimates for x versus time are shown in Fig. 2. It can be seen that all the agents converge to the same optimal solution which satisfies all the local constraints and minimizes the sum of local objective functions, without knowing other agents' constraints or feasible sets. Fig. 3 shows the trajectories of the auxiliary variable λ_i's and verifies the boundedness of the algorithm trajectories.



Fig. 3. Trajectories of the auxiliary variable λ's versus time

V. Conclusions

In this note, a novel distributed projected continuous-time algorithm has been proposed for a distributed nonsmooth optimization under local set constraints. By virtue of projected differential inclusions and nonsmooth analysis, the proposed algorithm has been proved to be convergent while keeping the states bounded. Furthermore, based on the stability theory and convergence results for nonsmooth Lyapunov functions, the algorithm has been shown to solve the convex optimization problem with a continuum of optimal solutions. Finally, the algorithm performance has also been illustrated via a numerical simulation.

References

[1] A. Nedic, A. Ozdaglar, and P. A. Parrilo, "Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 922–938, 2010.

[2] I. Lobel and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed subgradient methods for convex optimization over random networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 1291–1306, 2011.

[3] J. Wang and N. Elia, "Control approach to distributed optimization," in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Commun., Control and Comput.*, Monticello, IL, 2010, pp. 557–561.

[4] B. Gharesifard and J. Cortés, "Distributed continuous-time convex optimization on weight-balanced digraphs," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 781–786, 2014.

[5] G. Shi, K. Johansson, and Y. Hong, "Reaching an optimal consensus: Dynamical systems that compute intersections of convex sets," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 610–622, 2013.

[6] P. Yi, Y. Hong, and F. Liu, "Distributed gradient algorithm for constrained optimization with application to load sharing in power systems," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 83, pp. 45–52, 2015.

[7] S. S. Kia, J. Cortés, and S. Martínez, "Distributed convex optimization via continuous-time coordination algorithms with discrete-time communication," *Automatica*, vol. 55, pp. 254–264, 2015.

[8] Z. Qiu, S. Liu, and L. Xie, "Distributed constrained optimal consensus of multi-agent systems," *Automatica*, vol. 68, pp. 209–215, 2016.

[9] K. J. Arrow, L. Hurwicz, and H. Uzawa, *Studies In Linear And Non-Linear Programming: Stanford Mathematical Studies In The Social Sciences, No. 2*. Stanford: Stanford university press, 1972.

[10] A. Ruszczynski, *Nonlinear Optimization*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2006.

[11] A. Nagurney and D. Zhang, *Projected Dynamical Systems and Variational Inequalities with Applications*. Boston, Massachusetts: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996.

[12] Q. Liu and J. Wang, "A second-order multi-agent network for bound-constrained distributed optimization," *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 3310–3315, 2015.

[13] A. F. Filippov, *Differential Equations with Discontinuous Right-Hand Sides*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer, 1988.

[14] L. Shu, X. Zeng, and Y. Hong, "Lyapunov Stability and Generalized Invariance Principle for Nonconvex Differential Inclusions," *Control Theory and Technology*, to appear.

[15] J. P. Aubin and A. Cellina, *Differential Inclusions*. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 1984.

[16] E. P. Ryan, "An integral invariance principle for differential inclusions with applications in adaptive control," *SIAM J. Control Optim*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 960–980, 1998.

[17] F. H. Clarke, *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*. New York: Wiley, 1983.

[18] Q. Hui, W. M. Haddad, and S. P. Bhat, "Semistability, finite-time stability, differential inclusions, and discontinuous dynamical systems having a continuum of equilibria," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 2465–2470, 2009.

[19] Z. Denkowski, S. Migórski, and N. S. Papageorgiou, *An Introduction to Nonlinear Analysis: Theory*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag New York Inc., 2003.

[20] D. Kinderlehrer and G. Stampacchia, *An Introduction to Variational Inequalities and Their Applications*. New York: Academic, 1982.